

Remarks

Applicant apologize for the minor clerical/typographical error(s) in the specification, and thanks the Examiner for the suggested corrections of those errors. Applicant's amendment includes the Examiner's requirements, requests, and suggestion made during telephone interview on 02/23/2009 and brief telephone conversation on 02/27/2009.

1. In Specification

Applicant has amended Specification for minor informalities with respect to the clerical/typographical error(s).

2. In Claims:

Claims 26, 28, 29, 33-35, 37 are pending.

Claims 26, 28, 29, 33, 34 are rejected.

Claims 35, 37 are objected and are the Allowable Subject Matter.

Claims 35, 37 are the allowable subject matter and have been amended for allowance in compliance with all PTO's requirements, requests, and suggestion made by PTO in Office Action and during telephone interview on 02/23/2009 and brief telephone conversation on 02/27/2009

Claims 26, 28, 29, 33, 34 have been canceled without prejudice.

No new matters have been added.

All amendments are fully supported in the originally filed application.

3. According Objection of the disclosure (Specification) (item 1 on page 2 of Office Action [hereinafter "OA"]):

Applicant has amended the specification.

Applicant respectfully traversed the disclosure objection, and the objection of the disclosure as amended should be withdrawn.

4. According Objection of the Claims 28, 29, 35 and 37 (item 2 on pages 2-3 of OA):

Applicant has canceled the claims 28, 29.

Applicant has amended the allowable subject matter in the claim 35, as it has been discussed and agreed during telephone interview of 02/23/2009. The "double inclusion" is eliminated by applicant. The "arrangement of the switching means comprising three positions" has been discussed during telephone interview of 02/23/2009 and the arrangement of the switching means comprising three positions has been accepted by PTO.

Applicant has amended the allowable subject matter in the claims 37, as it has been discussed and agreed during telephone interview of 02/23/2009 and brief telephone conversation on 02/27/2009. The "recitation that said "connection means" can also pass through the aperture appears to be inaccurate" has been discussed during telephone interview on 02/23/2009 and brief telephone conversation on 02/27/2009. The proposed by applicant limitation - "an appropriate aperture" has been criticized by PTO during the brief telephone conversation on 02/27/2009 with respect to "appropriate". During the brief telephone conversation on 02/27/2009 PTO also discussed the unclear alternative construction of the claim 37 (i.e. using the alternative "or" and "or" for the passing of the different elements through the same apertu-

re). Applicant has amended claim 37 to clarify the limitation of "aperture" with respect to the alternative passing of the different elements through that aperture.

If the amended claim 37, presented hereinabove, will not satisfy the PTO, applicant respectfully proposes the eliminating alternative construction claim 37 with the additional new claims 39, 40 as follows:

37. The device of claim 35, wherein said main axle of said mechanical power supply is further connected to coupled with said non-retractable telescopic section of said plurality of telescopic sections of said telescopic portion of said portable cleaning device through a connection means, and wherein said aperture in each or in said at least one front wall provides an unobstructed passage of said non-retractable telescopic section of said telescopic portion handle means of said portable cleaning device includes said at least one front wall which comprises said aperture for said unobstructed passage of said telescopic portion or said axle or said connection means.

38. (canceled)

39. (new) The device of claim 37, wherein said aperture in said each or in said at least one front wall further provides said unobstructed passage of a connecting element.

40. (new) The device of claim 37, wherein said aperture in said each or in said at least one front wall further provides said unobstructed passage of said main axle of said mechanical power supply.

Applicant respectfully traversed the objection of claims 28, 29, and the objection of cla-

ims 28, 29 as canceled should be withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully traversed the objection of the allowable subject matter (claims 35 and 37), and the objection of claims 35 and 37 as amended should be withdrawn.

5. According Rejection - 35 USC §103 of the claim 26, 28, 29, 33, 34 (items 3-5 on pages 3-7 of OA):

Applicant has canceled claims 26, 28, 29, 33, 34. {P.S. Applicant did not find the patent to Gustems (by the inventor's name "Gustem" and "Gustems") during recent patent search on the PTO's Web-site. The patent number was not been provided}.

Applicant respectfully traversed the rejection of the claims 26, 28, 29, 33, 34, and the rejection of the claims 26, 28, 29, 33, 34 as canceled should be withdrawn.

6. According Allowable Subject Matter (item 6 on page 7 of OA):

According PTO: "Claims 35 and 37 are objected to as being dependant upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims".

Applicant has amended the claims 35 and 37 including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, as it has been required by PTO.

Applicant respectfully traversed the objection of the allowable subject matter (claims 35 and 37), and the objection of claims 35 and 37 as amended should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

The claimed by applicant an anticipated, new and unobvious combination of the means (elements, components, parts) and their connection to each other produces advantages militates in favor of applicant, because it proves that the applicant's new and unobvious combination produces not complex, reliable, and convenient portable cleaning device.

Thus, applicant has canceled the claims 26, 28, 29, 33, 34 and amended claims 35, 37 in accordance with the allowable subject matter and Examiner's requirements and suggestions made in the OA, and discussions and agreements made during telephone interview on , 02/23/2209 and brief telephone conversation on 02/27/2009 and the allowable subject matter claims 35, 37 now are completely suitable for allowance.

Applicant, as a pro-se applicant, apologize to the Examiner for the minor errors, and thanks the Examiner for the constructive suggestions leading to the appropriate applicant's amendments presented in this Amendment, and also applicant thanks the Examiner for the extremely prompt response (even after PTO's business hours) to the applicant's telephone calls.

Thus, in view of the foregoing amendments and accompanying remarks, the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejections of claims 26, 28, 29, 33, 34 as canceled should be withdrawn, and the objection of the allowable subject matter claims 35, 37 should be withdrawn, because the claims 35 and 37 are proper, and define the novel, none-anticipated portable cleaning device, which is also unobvious.

If, for any reasons this application is not believed to be in full condition for allowance, appli-

cant as pro-se applicant, greatly appreciate the constructive assistance and suggestions of the Examiner pursuant to M.P.E.P. 706.03(d) and M.P.E.P. 707.07(j) in order that undersigned can place this application in allowable condition as soon as possible and without the need for further proceedings, and if the Examiner feels that applicant's present claims are not entirely suitable, the Examiner drafts one or more allowable claims for applicant pursuant to M.P.E.P. 706.03(d) and M.P.E.P. 707.07(j).

The Examiner is requested to contact applicant, at the telephone number indicated below, to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

For all the reasons given above, applicant respectfully submits that the claims 35, 37 comply with the 35 USC.

Accordingly, applicant submits that this application is now in full condition for allowance, which action applicant respectfully solicits.

2 Very respectfully,



Yelena V. Yufa

March 02, 2009

Correspondence mailing address:

Y. Yufa
698 Cypress Avenue,
Colton, CA 92324
Phone: (909) 370-4454

Certificate of Mailing

I certify that this correspondence will be deposited with the United States Postal Service as Certified Mail # 7006 2760 0004 3379 9726 proper postage affixed in an envelope addressed to: "Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA. 22313-1450 on the date below.

Date: March 02, 2009 Applicant: Yelena V. Yufa

